

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached are Replacement Sheets of the drawings for consideration by the Examiner.

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of February 16, 2005. With this response claims 1, 5, 7, 14 and 15 are amended, new drawings are submitted and the abstract is amended. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant notes that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith. Consideration and entry of the Information Disclosure Statement are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested corrected drawings. Replacement sheets are submitted herewith and it is believed that the objection may be withdrawn.

Similarly, the Examiner objected to language in the abstract. The abstract has been amended and it is believed that the objection may be withdrawn.

Minor typographical errors were noted in claims 5 and 7. Those errors have been corrected and it is believed that the objection against those claims may be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based upon U.S. Patent No. 5,447,047 to Lin. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, it is believed that the rejection may be withdrawn. Additionally, Appendix A is submitted herewith which further describes differences between the claimed invention and the Lin reference.

One aspect of the present invention includes placement of the access control means entirely within the locking cylinder body. The claims have been amended to more clearly reflect this.

With the claimed configuration, a lock can be easily changed by simply replacing the cylinder. In contrast, the configuration of Lin clearly shows that components are outside of

the cylinder. This make replacement much more difficult. For example, the circuit board 10 of Lin is illustrated in figure 1B as being a separate panel which is carried in the door latch body. Therefore, it is believed that the rejection against the independent claims, along with their dependent claims, may be withdrawn.

Independent claim 12 was also rejected based upon Lin.

Independent claim 12 includes a means for exchanging a wireless data signal with the access control means of the door lock. The Office Action cites element 11 of Lin as being such an access control means and cites the language at col. 2, lines 10-15. That description states that element 11 of Lin can operate with fingerprints. However, there is no discussion that element 11 can wirelessly exchange a data signal with the access control means of the door lock. As stated above, if the access control means is considered to be element 11 of Lin, there is nothing in Lin that describes it exchanging wireless data with another access control means. In fact, element 11 of Lin is more similar to the means for detecting biometric information of claim 12. Thus, the rejection against claims 12 and 13 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 14 is similar to independent claim 1 in that it states that the access control elements are located entirely within the cylindrical lock body. Therefore, the rejection against claim 14 should be withdrawn.

The method claim 15 has also been amended to clarify that the access control means is entirely within the cylindrical lock body. For the above reasons, the rejection against claim 15 should also be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:bjt